

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/721,075	TANAKA, KOICHIRO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	M. Alexandra Elve	3742	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) M. Alexandra Elve *AE* (3) Tadaaki Maekoya, Yasuhiko Takemura *TM YJ*
 (2) Eric Robinson, Satomi Hata *SH* (4) Chikako Matsumoto, Ryoji Nomura *CM RN*

Date of Interview: 22 April 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 10.

Identification of prior art discussed: Yamazaki et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner will further explain limitations of claim 10, ie beam spot of first laser beam being larger than the second laser beam. Discussed apparatus claims and the relationship to Yamazaki et al. and possible amendments.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/M. Alexandra Elve/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3742

April 22, 2009.